



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: BROWN ET AL. ) Attorneys' Ref. P214419  
Serial No.: 10/761,537 ) Art Unit: 2125  
Filing Date: 01/21/2004 ) Examiner: Zoila E. Cabrera  
Title: MOTION CONTROL )  
SYSTEMS )

**AMENDMENT**

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2006. It is believed that no fee or charge is due at this time to maintain the application in full force and effect. However, if any such fee or charge is due, please charge this to Deposit Account No. 502099.

**REMARKS**

This Response is filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 13, 2006. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected a number of claims based on the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and claims 18-73, 86-97, 122-128, 130-132, 148-174, and 183-190 under 35 USC § 102(e) based on U.S. Publication No. 2002/0044297 A1 to Tanaka. The Examiner further rejected claim 62 under 35 USC § 101 as being to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner further objected to claim 129.

Referring initially to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 26, 35, 49, 62, and 86 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting based on claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,941,543, 6,513,058, 5,867,385, 6,516,236, and 5,691,897 and copending U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/761,537. The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's conclusions that the claims of the present application are not patentably distinct from the claims of the various patents and patent application cited in the March 13 Office Action. However, the Applicant believes that